

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/671,992 09/26/2003		09/26/2003	Greg Edward Kontos	GEK092603	8864	
34201	7590	06/01/2006		EXAMINER		
GREG KO		1 D.T. 5	MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA			
2219 W. GR RICHMONI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1764		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
. Office Action Summary			92	KONTOS, GREG EDWARD					
				Art Unit					
		Virginia M		1764					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	idress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IN THE MAY BE AVAILABLE OF THE MAY	NG DATE OF THE CFR 1.136(a). In no evicion. period will apply and we statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tim ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from dication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	22 January 200	1 <u>4</u> .	•					
•	•	This action is r							
3)									
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)□	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.								
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				•				
· ·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election r	equirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
	. The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer							
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	•	□ objected to by the F	Examiner					
ليارها	Applicant may not request that any objection	`							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c		•		ED 1 121/d\				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by t	· ·							
•	·	THE EXAMINET. TW		Addon or form 1	10-102.				
•	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)[12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachmen 1) ⊠ Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
	e of Neierences Cited (* 10-092) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	48)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PT)	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/671,992 Page 2

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the inclusion of legal phraseology often used in patent claims such as "consists of " in line 2. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, e.g., typographical, grammar, idiomatic, syntax and etc. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a). Claim 1 is incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are the relationships for examples among the outer shell, lower chamber and upper chamber.
- b). The claims are incomplete for omitting essential elements such as: for examples only: an evaporator and heater to cause the evaporation of water and a condenser for the condensation of evaporate in claim 1. Likewise, claim 3 is incomplete

Art Unit: 1764

for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The steps e.g., of how fresh water will be produced are omitted.

- c). The claimed "the above parts" in claim 6, provides for ambiguity since " A single piece manufacture", e.g., would not fall within the part.
- d). Regarding claim3, the phrase "similar apparatus" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "similar", thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
- e). There are no proper antecedent basis for supports in the claims for the following languages:
- 1). "the center of the pipe" in claim 1, section 5.
- 2). "the method of water desalination" in claim 3.
 - f). The term "I" in claims 1-3 should be deleted as being superfluous.
- g). It is unclear whether claim 3 is an independent claim or dependent from claim 1.
- h). Claim 2 is indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language " as described below". [This claim is an omnibus type claim].
- i). It is unclear why water is pumped inland only to be returned back to source as recited in claim 3.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/671,992

Art Unit: 1764

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over anyone of Fisher (3,300,393), Constantz (5,067,272) or Ramer (4,209,363).

As best as the claims can be understood, anyone of Constantz, Ramer or Fisher is deemed to anticipates or renders obvious the claimed partially separated dual chambered pipe for the desalination or distillation of water comprising: single piece manufacture; an outer shell, semi-circular on the bottom and triangular at the top;a lower chamber for the transport of salt or brackish water and the evaporation of said water; an upper chamber for the condensation of evaporate and collection and distribution of the evaporate, and two separators with supports as claimed in claims 1 and 2.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anyone of Constantz, Fisher or Ramer in view of Kaneko ((5.409,578).

Constantz, Fisher or Ramer is applied for the "similar apparatus" claimed in claim

1. Kaneko is applied to teach that the method of water desalination which includes

Art Unit: 1764

pumping salt or brackish water inland and allowing aforementioned water to flow back towards the ocean under the power of gravity through the pipe in order to produce fresh water is a known expediency in the art. To combine the above references would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, inasmuch as all the references are directed to the same processing environment, i.e., to obtaining fresh water by solar distillation.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a). Clavier discloses desalting water by using solar energy.
- b). Wilkerson, Gumucio and Delano all disclose a solar still assembly.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to V. Manoharan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1450.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,992

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VIRGINA MANCHAHAN PRIMARY EXAMINET

ARTUNIT 133 1764 5/30/06 Page 6